



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/870,992 | 06/01/2001 | James D. Flavin | 19134.0007 | 8292 |
| 7590 11/23/2005 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Fenwick & West LLP Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 | | | GUILL, RUSSELL L | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2123 | |
| DATE MAILED: 11/23/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/870,992

Applicant(s)

FLAVIN, JAMES D.

Examiner

Russell L. Guill

Art Unit

2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/10/2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The action is in response to an Amendment filed September 19, 2005. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 17 – 20 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1 – 20 have been examined. Claims 1 – 20 have been rejected.

Response to Remarks

2. Regarding **claims 1 – 16** rejected under 35 USC § 101:
 - 2.1. Regarding claim 16, the Applicant's amendments overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 101, and the rejection is withdrawn.
 - 2.2. Regarding claims 1 – 15, Applicants amendment brings the claims within the technological arts, however the claims still appear to be directed to an abstract idea or algorithm that does not result in a concrete and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. An abstract idea which is machine implemented is not statutory (Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, Annex III, section d).
3. Regarding **claims 1 – 16** rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a):
 - 3.1. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that, in Shah, user permission information is not propagated to at least one application server within the data center, as claimed. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's contention that the step of "propagating ... permission information to at least one application server within the data center is disclosed in Shah."
 - 3.1.1. The Examiner respectfully replies:

3.1.1.1. The relevant claim limitation is: propagating at least one of the organization unit, the group identification number, and the permission information to at least one application server within the data center

3.1.1.2. The claim limitation only requires **at least one of** the organization unit, the group identification number, and the permission information to the application server. The Examiner respectfully notes that Shah teaches propagating permission information to an application server, as follows. Shah teaches server-side Java objects providing access control and administrative services, where access control includes approved user list and inter-company workgroups (**page 3, lines 26 – 31; and page 6, lines 23 – 31, continuing on page 7, lines 1 – 6**). These server-side objects reside on the application servers (**figure 1, elements 112 and App Server**). Therefore, it would have been obvious that Shah teaches propagating permission information to at least one application server within a data center, since user permission information must have been propagated to the server-side objects for providing access control.

3.2. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant also argues that neither Minasi, Shaw, Tanenbaum or Debique cure the deficiency in Shah regarding propagating at least one of the organization unit, the group identification number, and the permission information to at least one application server within the data center.

3.2.1. The Examiner respectfully replies, that as discussed above, Shah teaches the claim limitation, and therefore the contributions of the other references are not needed.

3.3. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that the combination of Shah and Minasi would provide nothing beyond Shah itself, since Minasi makes no suggestion or recommendation as to how to extend or further implement Shah as to produce the claimed invention. Indeed, the combination of the two references would result in a system for provisioning application services to users, in which permission information is stored in a central database.

3.3.1. The Examiner respectfully replies, that as discussed above, Shah teaches the claim limitation to propagate permission information to at least one application server, and therefore the contribution of Minasi is not needed.

3.4. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that it would not be obvious to modify Shah and Minasi to propagate user information including permissions to at least one application server. It is not obvious to modify Minasi to propagate user information to at least one application server because all Minasi is concerned with is providing access to network resources.

3.4.1. The Examiner respectfully replies, that as discussed above, Shah teaches the claim limitation to propagate permission information to at least one application server, and therefore the contribution of Minasi is not needed.

3.5. Regarding claim 16, while still referring to the aforementioned claim limitation regarding propagating permissions, the Applicant also argues that claim 16 is patentable over the cited references.

3.5.1. The Examiner respectfully replies that claim 16 does not contain the aforementioned claim limitation regarding propagating permissions, and therefore is not applicable.

3.6. Therefore, as discussed above, the rejections are maintained.

Claim Objections

3.7. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites, “and the permission information.” The phrase appears to refer to the previously mentioned user permission information. Reference to the previous limitation should remain consistent to avoid any possible confusion or antecedent issues. Appropriate correction is requested.

3.8. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites, “permission information.” The phrase appears to refer to the previously mentioned user permission information. Reference to the previous limitation should remain consistent to avoid any possible confusion or antecedent issues. Appropriate correction is requested.

3.9. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites, “the permission information.” The phrase appears to refer to the previously mentioned user permission information. Reference to the previous limitation should remain consistent to avoid any possible confusion or antecedent issues. Appropriate correction is requested.

3.10. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites, “the administration database.” The phrase appears to refer to the previously mentioned database for storing administrative data (i.e., an administrative database). Reference to the previous limitation should remain consistent to avoid any possible confusion or antecedent issues. Appropriate correction is requested.

3.11. Dependent claims 17 and 18 are objected to because they both recite claim 1 as their parent claim; however, claim 1 is not directed to a system. For the purpose of

claim examination, both claims are interpreted as referring to **claim 16** as their parent claim. Appropriate correction is requested.

- 3.12.** Claims 4 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites, "store in administrative database." The phrase appears to be missing an indefinite article. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase is interpreted as, "store in an administrative database." Appropriate correction is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4.** The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 5.** Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Regarding claims 17 and 20, the claims recite, "the organization entity". The phrase lacks sufficient antecedent basis. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase, "the organization entity" is interpreted as "an organization entity". Correction or amendment is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

- 6.** 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims appear to be directed to an abstract idea or algorithm that does not result in a concrete and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1 – 9 and 13 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (International Publication Number WO 99/22332) in view of Minasi (Minasi, Mark; “Mastering Windows NT Server 4”, 1998, SYBEX), further in view of common knowledge in the art.

9.1. The art of Shah is directed toward a system for providing remote applications and computing resources over a network (***Abstract***), including access control and billing (***page 5, lines 4 - 25***).

9.2. The art of Minasi is directed toward managing the Windows NT Server 4 operating system.

9.3. Regarding claim 1:

- 9.3.1. Shah appears to teach a data center with application servers (figure 1, and Abstract).
- 9.3.2. Shah appears to teach creating an organization entity within the data center (page 5, lines 4 – 25).
- 9.3.3. Shah appears to teach creating user permission information for application services for the organization entity (page 3, lines 26 – 31; and page 5, lines 5 – 16; page 6, lines 23 – 31; it would have been obvious that access control for users in a workgroup required creating user permission information for an organization entity).
- 9.3.4. Shah appears to teach propagating at least one of the organization unit, the group identification number, and the permission information to at least one application server within the data center (page 5, lines 15 – 23; and figure 1, App servers; and page 3, lines 26 – 31; and page 6, lines 23 – 31, continuing on page 7, lines 1 – 6; and figure 1, elements 112 and App Server).
- 9.3.5. Shah does not specifically teach creating an organization unit for the organization entity.
- 9.3.6. Shah does not specifically teach associating a group identification number with the organization entity.
- 9.3.7. Minasi appears to teach creating an organization unit for the organization entity (page 70, section Groups; please refer to the organization units Biology and Chemistry).

9.3.8. Official Notice is taken that it was common knowledge to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to assign a numeric code to represent an organization entity. For example, the simulation and modeling group of examiners at the U.S. PTO is assigned the art unit number 2123. The motivation to associate a numeric code to an organization entity would have been obvious because it allows similar organizational units to be grouped together in a hierarchical classification numbering structure (e.g. KINGDOM, PHYLUM, CLASS, ORDER, FAMILY, GENUS, SPECIES). For example, art unit 2123 is in the technology center 2100.

9.3.9. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (**Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5**).

9.3.10. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Minasi that common rights and permissions can be assigned to collections of users in the same group (**page 70, section Groups, first paragraph**), and the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (**page 6, lines 1 – 3**).

9.4. Regarding claim 2:

9.4.1. Shah appears to teach collecting information about the organization entity, and storing the collected information in an administrative database (**figure 1, element 112; and page 5, lines 10 – 25; and page 7, lines 4 – 6; and page 3, lines 26 – 31**).

9.5. Regarding claim 3:

9.5.1. Shah appears to teach associating a suffix with the organization entity, and verifying the uniqueness of the suffix within the data center (page 5, lines 20 – 25).

9.5.1.1. Regarding (page 5, lines 20 – 25); it would have been obvious to associate a unique suffix to identify a business object.

9.6. Regarding claim 4:

9.6.1. Shah appears to teach storing in an administrative database the suffix, the organization unit and the group identification number (page 5, lines 20 – 22; and page 3, lines 26 – 31).

9.7. Regarding claim 5:

9.7.1. Shah appears to teach storing permission information for application services in association with the organization entity in an administrative database (page 6, lines 22 – 31; specifically, Access control; and page 3, lines 26 – 31vv).

9.8. Regarding claim 6:

9.8.1. Shah appears to teach that permission information includes information identifying the application services (page 5, lines 24 – 31; and page 6, lines 11 – 22).

9.9. Regarding claim 7:

9.9.1. Shah appears to teach that application services include rendering a published application (page 6, lines 1 – 5).

9.9.1.1. Regarding (page 6, lines 1 – 5); it would have been obvious that rendering is performed for published applications.

9.10. Regarding claim 8:

9.10.1. Shah appears to teach that application services include rendering a custom application (page 6, lines 1 – 5).

9.10.1.1. Regarding (page 6, lines 1 – 5); it would have been obvious that rendering is performed for custom applications.

9.11. Regarding claim 9:

9.11.1. Shah appears to teach storing permission information for data associated with the organization entity in the administrative database (page 6, lines 23 – 31; and page 5, lines 4 - 23; and page 3, lines 26 - 31).

9.12. Regarding claim 13:

9.12.1. Shah appears to teach propagating at least one of the organization unit and the group identification number to at least one application server within the data center (page 5, lines 15 – 23; and figure 1, App servers; and page 3, lines 26 - 31).

9.12.2. Shah does not specifically teach adding a user to the organization entity.

9.12.3. Shah does not specifically teach associating a user identification with the user.

- 9.12.4. Shah does not specifically teach propagating **the user identification in association with** at least one of the organization unit and the group identification number to at least one application server within the data center.
- 9.12.5. Minasi appears to teach adding a user to the organization entity (**page 355, figure 6.5 Group Memberships**).
- 9.12.6. Minasi appears to teach associating a user identification with the user (**page 347, figure 6.1, columns labeled "Username" and "Full Name"**).
- 9.12.7. Minasi appears to teach associating a user identification with an organization (**page 355, figure 6.5 Group Memberships**).
- 9.12.8. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (**Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5**).
- 9.12.9. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Minasi that common rights and permissions can be assigned to collections of users in the same group (**page 70, section Groups, first paragraph**), and the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (**page 6, lines 1 – 3**).
- 9.13. Regarding claim 14:
- 9.13.1. Shah does not specifically teach storing the user identification in the administrative database.

9.13.2. Minasi appears to teach storing the user identification in the administrative database (pages 345 – 346, section labeled “User Accounts Sit on the PDC”).

9.13.2.1. Regarding (pages 345 – 346, section labeled “User Accounts Sit on the PDC”); it would have been obvious that registry is an administrative database.

9.13.3. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5).

9.13.4. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (page 6, lines 1 – 3).

9.14. Regarding claim 15:

9.14.1. Shah appears to teach storing permission information for application services in an administrative database (page 6, lines 23 – 31; and page 5, lines 4 – 31; and page 3, lines 26 – 31).

9.14.2. Shah does not specifically teach storing permission information for application services in association with the user identification in an administrative database.

9.14.3. Minasi appears to teach storing permission information for users in an administrative database (page 70, section labeled Groups).

9.14.4. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5).

9.14.5. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (page 6, lines 1 – 3).

9.15. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah to produce the claimed invention.

10. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (International Publication Number WO 99/22332) and Minasi (Minasi, Mark; “Mastering Windows NT Server 4”, 1998, SYBEX) and common knowledge in the art, in view of Shaw (U.S. Patent 6,104,392).

10.1. Claims 10 and 11 are dependent claims of claim 1, and thereby inherit all of the rejected limitations of claim 1.

10.2. The art of Shah is directed toward a system for providing remote applications and computing resources over a network (Abstract), including access control and billing (page 5, lines 4 - 25).

10.3. The art of Shaw is directed to displaying an application on a variety of client devices in a client/server network (Title of patent).

10.4. Regarding claim 10:

- 10.4.1.** Shah appears to teach that applications include Windows applications (page 5, lines 24 – 30).
- 10.4.2.** Shah does not specifically teach that the applications include Windows applications and UNIX applications.
- 10.4.3.** Shaw appears to teach that applications include UNIX applications (column 5, lines 64 – 66; and figure 1, elements 82C and 82).
- 10.4.4.** The art Shaw and the art of Shah are analogous art because they are both directed to a networked data processing environment using a client/server architecture (Shaw, column 1, lines 30 – 40; and figure 1) and (Shah, Abstract; and figure 1).
- 10.4.5.** The motivation to use the art of Shaw with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Shaw that the invention permits the efficient operation of an application (on the server) without overloading the connection to the client (column 4, lines 2 – 5).
- 10.5.** Regarding claim 11:
- 10.5.1.** Shah does not specifically teach that propagating is performed based on an active directory.
- 10.5.2.** Shaw appears to teach that propagating is performed based on an active directory (column 6, lines 45 – 60).
- 10.5.3.** The art Shaw and the art of Shah are analogous art because they are both directed to a networked data processing environment using a client/server

architecture (**Shaw, column 1, lines 30 – 40; and figure 1**) and (**Shah, Abstract; and figure 1**).

10.5.4. The motivation to use the art of Shaw with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Shaw that using the method of Shaw avoids duplication of information and functionality (**column 6, lines 49 – 56**).

10.6. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Shaw with the art of Shah to produce the claimed invention.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (International Publication Number WO 99/22332 and Minasi (Minasi, Mark; “Mastering Windows NT Server 4”, 1998, SYBEX), and common knowledge in the art, in view of Debique (U.S. Patent No. 5,613,079).

11.1. Claim 12 is a dependent claim of claim 1, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 1.

11.2. The art of Debique is directed to verification of replication of multi-master databases (**Abstract, and column 1, lines 10 – 65**).

11.3. Shah does not explicitly teach that propagating is performed based on a multi-master architecture.

11.4. Debique appears to teach a multi-master architecture (**Abstract, and column 1, lines 10 – 65**).

11.5. The art of Debique and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of distributed system environment (Debique, Abstract; and Shah, figure 1).

11.6. The motivation to use the art of Debique with the art of Shah would have been obvious given the distributed system of Shah (figure 1), and benefit in Debique that distributed database replication can be verified (Abstract, and column 1, lines 10 – 65).

11.7. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Debique with the art of Shah to produce the claimed invention.

12. Claims 16 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (International Publication Number WO 99/22332) in view of Minasi (Minasi, Mark; “Mastering Windows NT Server 4”, 1998, SYBEX), further in view of Tanenbaum (Tanenbaum, Andrew S.; “Computer Networks”, third edition, 1996, Prentice-Hall).

12.1. Regarding **claim 16**:

12.1.1. The art of Shah is directed toward a system for providing remote applications and computing resources over a network (Abstract), including access control and billing (page 5, lines 4 - 25).

12.1.2. The art of Minasi is directed toward managing the Windows NT Server 4 operating system.

12.1.3. The art of Tanenbaum is directed to computer networks (Title).

- 12.1.4. Shah appears to teach an application server array for providing applications to remote clients (**figure 1, App Servers**).
- 12.1.5. Shah appears to teach a brokering array for translating output from at least some of the applications to a communication protocol (**page 6, line 3; and page 6, lines 1 – 7**).
- 12.1.5.1. Regarding (**page 6, line 3; and page 6, lines 1 – 7**); it would have been obvious that for output of an application to appear on a client computer that the output is translated into a communications protocol.
- 12.1.6. Shah appears to teach a database for storing administrative data and application data (**figure 1, database service; and page 3, lines 27 – 31**).
- 12.1.7. Shah appears to teach a switching system for linking the database and arrays with each other and a communications network for delivering application service to remote clients (**figure 1**).
- 12.1.8. Shah appears to teach an administration array coupled to the database (**figure 1; and page 3, lines 27 – 31**), the administration array storing information into the administration database and propagating information to the application server array (**figure 1; and page 3, lines 27 – 31**).
- 12.1.9. Shah does not specifically teach an administration array coupled to the database, the administration array **receiving organization information**, storing **the** information into the administration database and propagating **the organization** information to the application array.

- 12.1.10. Shah does not appear to teach a **redundant** switching system for linking the database and arrays with each other and a communications network for delivering application service to remote clients.
- 12.1.11. Tanenbaum appears to teach a redundant switching system (**page 137, figure 2-39(a) and (b); and page 137, second paragraph that starts with the phrase "The second stage . . . "; and page 135, figure 2-37**).
- 12.1.12. The art Tanenbaum and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of interconnecting computers in a network (**Tanenbaum, Title**) and (**Shah, figure 1**).
- 12.1.13. The motivation to use the art of Tanenbaum with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Tanenbaum that the network system can connect calls along many paths (**page 135, first paragraph**).
- 12.1.14. Minasi appears to teach receiving organization information (**page 70, section Goups**), and storing the organization information into an administration database (**page 355, figure 6.5**).
- 12.1.14.1. Regarding (**page 355, figure 6.5**); it would have been obvious that the group organization information is stored in an administration database.
- 12.1.15. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (**Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5**).
- 12.1.16. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Minasi that common rights and permissions can be assigned to collections of users in the same group (**page 70,**

section Groups, first paragraph), and the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (page 6, lines 1 – 3).

12.1.17. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Tanenbaum with the art of Shah to produce the claimed invention.

12.2. Regarding **claim 17**:

12.2.1. Shah appears to teach propagating at least one of the organization unit and the group identification number to at least one application server within the data center (page 5, lines 15 – 23; and figure 1, App servers; and page 3, lines 26 - 31).

12.2.2. Shah does not specifically teach adding a user to the organization entity.

12.2.3. Shah does not specifically teach associating a user identification with the user.

12.2.4. Shah does not specifically teach propagating the user identification in association with at least one of the organization unit and the group identification number to at least one application server within the data center.

12.2.5. Minasi appears to teach adding a user to the organization entity (page 355, figure 6.5 Group Memberships).

12.2.6. Minasi appears to teach associating a user identification with the user (page 347, figure 6.1, columns labeled “Username” and “Full Name”).

12.2.7. Minasi appears to teach associating a user identification with an organization (page 355, figure 6.5 Group Memberships).

12.2.8. The art of Minasi and the art of Shah are analogous art because they both contain the problem of managing application server computers, and Shah appears to use Windows NT (**Shah, page 6, lines 1 – 5**).

12.2.9. The motivation to use the art of Minasi with the art of Shah would have been obvious because of the benefit recited in Minasi that common rights and permissions can be assigned to collections of users in the same group (**page 70, section Groups, first paragraph**), and the statement in Shah that Windows NT applications are used in Shah (**page 6, lines 1 – 3**).

12.3. Regarding claim 18:

12.3.1. Shah appears to teach associating a suffix with the organization entity, and verifying the uniqueness of the suffix within the data center (**page 5, lines 20 – 25**).

12.3.1.1. Regarding (**page 5, lines 20 – 25**); it would have been obvious to associate a unique suffix to identify a business object.

12.4. Regarding claim 19:

12.4.1. Shah appears to teach storing in an administrative database the suffix, the organization unit and the group identification number (**page 5, lines 20 – 22; and page 3, lines 26 – 31**).

12.5. Regarding claim 20:

12.5.1. Shah appears to teach storing permission information for application services in association with the organization entity in an administrative database (**page 6, lines 22 – 31; specifically, Access control; and page 3, lines 26 – 31**).

13. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final


action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell L. Guill whose telephone number is 571-272-7955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday 10:00 AM – 6:30 PM.
16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist: 571-272-2100.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RG

Russ Guill
Examiner
Art Unit 2123


Paul L. Rodriguez 11/18/05
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2125